arXiv:1401.5763v1 [math.CO] 22 Jan 2014

Long Cycles in 1-tough Graphs

Zh.G. Nikoghosyan*

January 23, 2014

Abstract

In 1952, Dirac proved that every 2-connected graph with minimum degree δ either is hamiltonian or contains a cycle of length at least 2δ. In 1986, Bauer and Schmeichel enlarged the bound 2δ to $2\delta + 2$ under additional 1-tough condition - an alternative and more natural necessary condition for a graph to be hamiltonian. In fact, the bound $2\delta+2$ is sharp for a graph on n vertices when $n \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$. In this paper we present the final version of this result which is sharp for each n: every 1-tough graph either is hamiltonian or contains a cycle of length at least $2\delta + 2$ when $n \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$, at least $2\delta + 3$ when $n \equiv 2(mod\ 3)$ or $n \equiv 1(mod\ 4)$, and at least $2\delta + 4$ otherwise.

Key words: Hamilton cycle, circumference, minimum degree, 1-tough graphs.

1 Introduction

Only finite undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges are considered. A good reference for any undefined terms is [2].

The earliest two theoretical results in hamiltonian graph theory were developed in 1952 due to Dirac [4] in forms of a sufficient condition for a graph to be hamiltonian and a lower bound for the circumference c (the length of a longest cycle of a graph), respectively, based on order n and minimum degree δ.

Theorem A [4]. Every graph with $\delta \geq n/2$ is hamiltonian.

Theorem B [4]. Every 2-connected graph either is hamiltonian or $c \geq 2\delta$.

In 1973, Chvátal [3] introduced the concept of toughness. Since then a lot of research has been done towards finding the exact analogs of classical hamiltonian results under additional 1-tough condition - an alternative and more natural necessary condition for a graph to be hamiltonian.

*G.G. Nicoghossian (up to 1997)

In 1978, Jung [5] established the analog of Theorem A for 1-tough graphs.

Theorem C [5]. Every 1-tough graph on $n \geq 11$ vertices with $\delta \geq (n-4)/2$ is hamiltonian.

In 1986, Bauer and Schmeichel [1] proved that the bound 2δ in Theorem B can be enlarged to $2\delta + 2$ for 1-tough graphs.

Theorem D [1]. Every 1-tough graph either is hamiltonian or $c \geq 2\delta + 2$.

In fact, Theorem D is sharp when $n \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$. In this paper we present the final version of Theorem D which is sharp for each n.

Theorem 1. Every 1-tough graph either is hamiltonian or

$$c \geq \begin{cases} 2\delta+2 & \text{when} \quad n \equiv 1(mod\ 3), \\ 2\delta+3 & \text{when} \quad n \equiv 2(mod\ 3) \ \text{ or } \ n \equiv 1(mod\ 4), \\ 2\delta+4 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1 is sharp for each n. To see this, let $H_1, H_2, ..., H_h$ be disjoint complete graphs with distinct vertices $x_i, y_i \in V(H_i)$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., h)$. Form a new graph $H(t_1, t_2, ..., t_h)$ by identifying the vertices $x_1, x_2, ..., x_h$ and adding all possible edges between $y_1, y_2, ..., y_h$, where $t_i = |V(H_i)|$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., h)$. The graph $H(\delta-1, \delta-1, \delta-1)$ shows that the bound $2\delta+2$ in Theorem 1 cannot be replaced by $2\delta+3$ when $n \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$. Next, the graphs $H(\delta, \delta-1, \delta-1)$ and $H(\delta-1, \delta-1, \delta-1, \delta-1)$ show that the bound $2\delta+3$ cannot be replaced by $2\delta+4$ when $n \equiv 2(mod\ 3)$ or $n \equiv 1(mod\ 4)$. Finally, the graph $H(\delta, \delta, \delta-1)$ shows that the bound $2\delta+4$ cannot be replaced by $2\delta+5$.

2 Notations and preliminaries

The set of vertices of a graph G is denoted by $V(G)$ and the set of edges by $E(G)$. For S a subset of $V(G)$, we denote by $G\backslash S$ the maximum subgraph of G with vertex set $V(G)\backslash S$. We write $\langle S \rangle$ for the subgraph of G induced by S. For a subgraph H of G we use $G\backslash H$ short for $G\backslash V(H)$. The neighborhood and the degree of a vertex $x \in V(G)$ will be denoted by $N(x)$ and $d(x)$, respectively. Furthermore, for a subgraph H of G and $x \in V(G)$, we define $N_H(x) = N(x) \cap V(H)$ and $d_H(x) = |N_H(x)|$. Let $s(G)$ denote the number of components of a graph G. A graph G is 1-tough if $|S| \geq s(G\backslash S)$ for every subset S of the vertex set $V(G)$ with $s(G\backslash S) > 1$. A graph G on n vertices is hamiltonian if G contains a Hamilton cycle, i.e. a cycle of length n.

Paths and cycles in a graph G are considered as subgraphs of G. If Q is a path or a cycle, then the length of Q, denoted by $|Q|$, is $|E(Q)|$. We write Q with a given orientation by $\overrightarrow{Q}$. For $x, y \in V(Q)$, we denote by $x\overrightarrow{Q}y$ the subpath of Q in the chosen direction from x to y. For $x \in V(C)$, we denote the h-th successor and the h-th predecessor of x on $\overrightarrow{C}$ by x^{+h} and x^{-h}, respectively. We

abbreviate x^{+1} and x^{-1} by x^+ and x^-, respectively. For each $X \subset V(C)$, we define $X^+ = \{x^+ | x \in X\}$ and $X^- = \{x^- | x \in X\}$.

Special definitions. Let G be a graph, C a longest cycle in G and $P = x\overrightarrow{P}y$ a longest path in $G\backslash C$ of length $\overline{p} \geq 0$. Let $\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_s$ be the elements of $N_C(x) \cup N_C(y)$ occuring on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. Set

$$I_i = \xi_i \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{i+1},\ I_i^* = \xi_i^+ \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{i+1}^-\ \ (i = 1, 2, ..., s),$$

where $\xi_{s+1} = \xi_1$.

(1) The segments $I_1, I_2, ..., I_s$ are called elementary segments on C induced by $N_C(x) \cup N_C(y)$.

(2) We call a path $L = z\overrightarrow{L}w$ an intermediate path between two distinct elementary segments I_a and I_b, if

$$z \in V(I_a^*),\ w \in V(I_b^*),\ V(L) \cap V(C \cup P) = \{z, w\}.$$

(3) Define $\Upsilon(I_{i_1}, I_{i_2}, ..., I_{i_t})$ to be the set of all intermediate paths between elementary segments $I_{i_1}, I_{i_2}, ..., I_{i_t}$.

(4) If $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s) \subseteq E$ then the maximum number of intermediate independent edges (having no a common vertex) in $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ will be denoted by $\mu(\Upsilon)$.

(5) We say that two intermediate independent edges w_1w_2, w_3w_4 have a crossing, if either w_1, w_3, w_2, w_4 or w_1, w_4, w_2, w_3 occur on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order.

Lemma 1. Let G be a graph, C a longest cycle in G and $P = x\overrightarrow{P}y$ a longest path in $G\backslash C$ of length $\overline{p} \geq 1$. If $|N_C(x)| \geq 2$, $|N_C(y)| \geq 2$ and $N_C(x) \neq N_C(y)$ then

$$c \geq \begin{cases} 3\delta + \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} - 1 \geq 3\delta & \text{if} \quad \overline{p} = 1, \\ 4\delta - 2\overline{p} & \text{if} \quad \overline{p} \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\sigma_1 = |N_C(x)\backslash N_C(y)|$ and $\sigma_2 = |N_C(y)\backslash N_C(x)|$.

Lemma 2. Let G be a graph, C a longest cycle in G and $P = x\overrightarrow{P}y$ a longest path in $G\backslash C$ of length $\overline{p} \geq 0$. Let $N_C(x) = N_C(y)$, $|N_C(x)| \geq 2$ and $f, g \in \{1, ..., s\}$.

(a1) If $L \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ then

$$|I_f| + |I_g| \geq 2\overline{p} + 2|L| + 4.$$

(a2) If $\Upsilon(I_f, I_g) \subseteq E(G)$ and $|\Upsilon(I_f, I_g)| = \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ then

$$|I_f| + |I_g| \geq 2\overline{p} + \varepsilon + 5,$$

(a3) If $\Upsilon(I_f, I_g) \subseteq E(G)$ and $\Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ contains two independent intermediate edges then

$$|I_f| + |I_g| \geq 2\overline{p} + 8.$$

The following result is due to Voss [6].

Lemma 3 [6]. Let G be a hamiltonian graph, $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_t\} \subseteq V(G)$ and $d(v_i) \geq t$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., t)$. Then each pair x, y of vertices of G is connected in G by a path of length at least t.

3 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. Put

$$A_1 = N_C(x) \backslash N_C(y),\ A_2 = N_C(y) \backslash N_C(x),\ M = N_C(x) \cap N_C(y).$$

By the hypothesis, $N_C(x) \neq N_C(y)$, implying that

$$\max\{|A_1|, |A_2|\} \geq 1.$$

Let $\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_s$ be the elements of $N_C(x) \cup N_C(y)$ occuring on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. Put $I_i = \xi_i \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{i+1}$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., s)$, where $\xi_{s+1} = \xi_1$. Clearly, $s = |A_1| + |A_2| + |M|$. Since C is extreme, we have $|I_i| \geq 2$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., s)$. Next, if $\{\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}\} \cap M \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, ..., s\}$ then $|I_i| \geq \overline{p} + 2$. Further, if either $\xi_i \in A_1$, $\xi_{i+1} \in A_2$ or $\xi_i \in A_2$, $\xi_{i+1} \in A_1$ then again $|I_i| \geq \overline{p} + 2$.

Case 1. $\overline{p} = 1$.
Case 1.1. $|A_i| \geq 1$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

It follows that among $I_1, I_2, ..., I_s$ there are $|M| + 2$ segments of length at least $\overline{p} + 2$. Observing also that each of the remaining $s - (|M| + 2)$ segments has a length at least 2, we have

$$c \geq (\overline{p} + 2)(|M| + 2) + 2(s - |M| - 2)$$

$$= 3(|M| + 2) + 2(|A_1| + |A_2| - 2) = 2|A_1| + 2|A_2| + 3|M| + 2.$$

Since $|A_1| = d(x) - |M| - 1$ and $|A_2| = d(y) - |M| - 1$, we have

$$c \geq 2d(x) + 2d(y) - |M| - 2 \geq 3\delta + d(x) - |M| - 2.$$

Recalling that $d(x) = |M| + |A_1| + 1$, we get

$$c \geq 3\delta + |A_1| - 1 = 3\delta + \sigma_1 - 1.$$

Analogously, $c \geq 3\delta + \sigma_2 - 1$. So,

$$c \geq 3\delta + \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} - 1 \geq 3\delta.$$

Case 1.2. Either $|A_1| \geq 1, |A_2| = 0$ or $|A_1| = 0, |A_2| \geq 1$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $|A_1| \geq 1$ and $|A_2| = 0$, i.e. $|N_C(y)| = |M| \geq 2$ and $s = |A_1| + |M|$. Hence, among $I_1, I_2, ..., I_s$ there are $|M| + 1$ segments of length at least $\overline{p} + 2 = 3$. Taking into account that $|M| + 1 = d(y)$ and each of the remaining $s - (|M| + 1)$ segments has a length at least 2, we get

$$c \geq 3(|M| + 1) + 2(s - |M| - 1) = 3d(y) + 2(|A_1| - 1)$$

$$\geq 3\delta + |A_1| - 1 = 3\delta + \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} - 1 \geq 3\delta.$$

Case 2. $\overline{p} \geq 2$.

Case 2.1. $|A_i| \geq 1$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

It follows that among $I_1, I_2, ..., I_s$ there are $|M| + 2$ segments of length at least $\overline{p} + 2$. Further, since each of the remaining $s - (|M| + 2)$ segments has a length at least 2, we get

$$c \geq (\overline{p} + 2)(|M| + 2) + 2(s - |M| - 2)$$

$$= (\overline{p} - 2)|M| + (2\overline{p} + 4|M| + 4) + 2(|A_1| + |A_2| - 2)$$

$$\geq 2|A_1| + 2|A_2| + 4|M| + 2\overline{p}.$$

Observing also that

$$|A_1| + |M| + \overline{p} \geq d(x), \quad |A_2| + |M| + \overline{p} \geq d(y),$$

we have

$$2|A_1| + 2|A_2| + 4|M| + 2\overline{p}$$

$$\geq 2d(x) + 2d(y) - 2\overline{p} \geq 4\delta - 2\overline{p},$$

implying that $c \geq 4\delta - 2\overline{p}$.

Case 2.2. Either $|A_1| \geq 1, |A_2| = 0$ or $|A_1| = 0, |A_2| \geq 1$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $|A_1| \geq 1$ and $|A_2| = 0$, that is $|N_C(y)| = |M| \geq 2$ and $s = |A_1| + |M|$. It follows that among $I_1, I_2, ..., I_s$ there are $|M| + 1$ segments of length at least $\overline{p} + 2$. Observing also that $|M| + \overline{p} \geq d(y) \geq \delta$, i.e. $2\overline{p} + 4|M| \geq 4\delta - 2\overline{p}$, we get

$$c \geq (\overline{p} + 2)(|M| + 1) \geq (\overline{p} - 2)(|M| - 1) + 2\overline{p} + 4|M|$$

$$\geq 2\overline{p} + 4|M| \geq 4\delta - 2\overline{p}. \qquad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_s$ be the elements of $N_C(x)$ occuring on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. Put $I_i = \xi_i \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{i+1}$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., s)$, where $\xi_{s+1} = \xi_1$. To prove $(a1)$, let $L \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$. Further, let $L = z\overrightarrow{L}w$ with $z \in V(I_f^*)$ and $w \in V(I_g^*)$. Put

$$|\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z| = d_1, \ |z\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{f+1}| = d_2, \ |\xi_g \overrightarrow{C} w| = d_3, \ |w\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{g+1}| = d_4,$$

$$C' = \xi_f x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_g \overleftarrow{C} z \overrightarrow{L} w \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f.$$

Clearly,

$$|C'| = |C| - d_1 - d_3 + |L| + |P| + 2.$$

Since C is extreme, we have $|C| \geq |C'|$, implying that $d_1 + d_3 \geq \overline{p} + |L| + 2$. By a symmetric argument, $d_2 + d_4 \geq \overline{p} + |L| + 2$. Hence

$$|I_f| + |I_g| = \sum_{i=1}^{4} d_i \geq 2\overline{p} + 2|L| + 4.$$

The proof of $(a1)$ is complete. To prove $(a2)$ and $(a3)$, let $\Upsilon(I_f, I_g) \subseteq E(G)$ and $|\Upsilon(I_f, I_g)| = \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Case 1. $\varepsilon = 1$.
Let $L \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$, where $|L| = 1$. By (a1),

$$|I_f| + |I_g| \geq 2\overline{p} + 2|L| + 4 = 2\overline{p} + 6.$$

Case 2. $\varepsilon = 2$.
It follows that $\Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ consists of two edges e_1, e_2. Put $e_1 = z_1 w_1$ and $e_2 = z_2 w_2$, where $\{z_1, z_2\} \subseteq V(I_f^*)$ and $\{w_1, w_2\} \subseteq V(I_g^*)$.

Case 2.1. $z_1 \neq z_2$ and $w_1 \neq w_2$.
Assume w.l.o.g. that z_1 and z_2 occur in this order on I_f.

Case 2.1.1. w_2 and w_1 occur in this order on I_g.
Put

$$|\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_1| = d_1,\ |z_1 \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = d_2,\ |z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}| = d_3,$$
$$|\xi_g \overrightarrow{C} w_2| = d_4,\ |w_2 \overrightarrow{C} w_1| = d_5,\ |w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{g+1}| = d_6,$$
$$C' = \xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_1 w_1 \overleftarrow{C} w_2 z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_g x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_{g+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f.$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} |C'| &= |C| - d_2 - d_4 - d_6 + |\{e_1\}| + |\{e_2\}| + |P| + 2 \\ &= |C| - d_2 - d_4 - d_6 + \overline{p} + 4. \end{aligned}$$

Since C is extreme, we have $|C| \geq |C'|$, implying that $d_2 + d_4 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 4$. By a symmetric argument, $d_1 + d_3 + d_5 \geq \overline{p} + 4$. Hence

$$|I_f| + |I_g| = \sum_{i=1}^{6} d_i \geq 2\overline{p} + 8.$$

Case 2.1.2. w_1 and w_2 occur in this order on I_g.
Putting

$$C' = \xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_1 w_1 \overrightarrow{C} w_2 z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_g x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_{g+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f,$$

we can argue as in Case 2.1.1.

Case 2.2. Either $z_1 = z_2$, $w_1 \neq w_2$ or $z_1 \neq z_2$, $w_1 = w_2$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $z_1 \neq z_2$, $w_1 = w_2$ and z_1, z_2 occur in this order on I_f. Put

$$|\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_1| = d_1,\ |z_1 \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = d_2,\ |z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}| = d_3,$$

$$|\xi_g \overrightarrow{C} w_1| = d_4,\ |w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{g+1}| = d_5,$$

$$C' = \xi_f x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_g \overleftarrow{C} z_1 w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f,$$

$$C'' = \xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_2 w_1 \overleftarrow{C} \xi_{f+1} x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_{g+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f.$$

Clearly,

$$|C'| = |C| - d_1 - d_4 + |\{e_1\}| + |P| + 2 = |C| - d_1 - d_4 + \overline{p} + 3,$$

$$|C''| = |C| - d_3 - d_5 + |\{e_2\}| + |P| + 2 = |C| - d_3 - d_5 + \overline{p} + 3.$$

Since C is extreme, $|C| \geq |C'|$ and $|C| \geq |C''|$, implying that

$$d_1 + d_4 \geq \overline{p} + 3,\ d_3 + d_5 \geq \overline{p} + 3.$$

Hence,

$$|I_f| + |I_g| = \sum_{i=1}^{5} d_i \geq d_1 + d_3 + d_4 + d_5 + 1 \geq 2\overline{p} + 7.$$

Case 3. $\varepsilon = 3$.

It follows that $\Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ consists of three edges e_1, e_2, e_3. Let $e_i = z_i w_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, where $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\} \subseteq V(I_f^*)$ and $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\} \subseteq V(I_g^*)$. If there are two independent edges among e_1, e_2, e_3 then we can argue as in Case 2.1. Otherwise, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $w_1 = w_2 = w_3$ and z_1, z_2, z_3 occur in this order on I_f. Put

$$|\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_1| = d_1,\ |z_1 \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = d_2,\ |z_2 \overrightarrow{C} z_3| = d_3,$$

$$|z_3 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}| = d_4,\ |\xi_g \overrightarrow{C} w_1| = d_5,\ |w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{g+1}| = d_6,$$

$$C' = \xi_f x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_g \overleftarrow{C} z_1 w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f,$$

$$C'' = \xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_3 w_1 \overleftarrow{C} \xi_{f+1} x \overrightarrow{P} y \xi_{g+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f.$$

Clearly,

$$|C'| = |C| - d_1 - d_5 + |\{e_1\}| + \overline{p} + 2,$$

$$|C''| = |C| - d_4 - d_6 + |\{e_3\}| + \overline{p} + 2.$$

Since C is extreme, we have $|C| \geq |C'|$ and $|C| \geq |C''|$, implying that

$$d_1 + d_5 \geq \overline{p} + 3,\ d_4 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 3.$$

Hence,

$$|I_f| + |I_g| = \sum_{i=1}^{6} d_i \geq d_1 + d_4 + d_5 + d_6 + 2 \geq 2\overline{p} + 8. \qquad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Let G be a 1-tough graph. If $c \geq 2\delta + 4$ then we are done. Hence, we can assume that

$$c \leq 2\delta + 3. \tag{1}$$

Let C be a longest cycle in G and $P = x_1\overrightarrow{P}x_2$ a longest path in $G\backslash C$. Put $|P| = |V(P)| - 1 = \overline{p}$. If $|V(P)| = 0$ then C is a Hamilton cycle and we are done. Let $|V(P)| \geq 1$, that is $\overline{p} \geq 0$. Put $X = N_C(x_1) \cup N_C(x_2)$ and let $\xi_1, ..., \xi_s$ be the elements of X occuring on C in a consecutive order. Put

$$I_i = \xi_i\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{i+1},\ I_i^* = \xi_i^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{i+1}^- \quad (i = 1, ..., s),$$

where $\xi_{s+1} = \xi_1$. Since G is a 1-tough graph, we have $\delta \geq 2$.

Case 1. $\overline{p} \leq \delta - 2$.

It follows that $s \geq |N_C(x_i)| \geq \delta - \overline{p} \geq 2$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Assume first that $N_C(x_1) \neq N_C(x_2)$, implying that $\overline{p} \geq 1$. If $\overline{p} \geq 2$ then by Lemma 1, $c \geq 4\delta - 2\overline{p} \geq 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1). Hence $\overline{p} = 1$, which yields $\delta \geq \overline{p} + 2 = 3$. By Lemma 1, $c \geq 3\delta \geq 9$. If $\delta \geq 4$ then $c \geq 3\delta \geq 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1). Let $\delta = 3$. Next, we can suppose that $c = 9$, since otherwise $c \geq 10 = 3\delta + 1 = 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1). Further, we can suppose that $s \geq 3$, since $N_C(x_1) = N_C(x_2)$ when $s = 2$, contradicting the hypothesis. Finally, we can suppose that $s = 3$, since clearly $c \geq 10$ when $s \geq 4$, a contradiction. Thus, $|I_1| = |I_2| = |I_3| = 3$ and it is not hard to see that $G\backslash\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$ has at least four components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$.

Now assume that $N_C(x_1) = N_C(x_2)$. Since C is extreme, we have

$$|I_i| \geq |\xi_i x_1 \overrightarrow{P} x_2 \xi_{i+1}| \geq \overline{p} + 2 \quad (i = 1, ..., s).$$

Case 1.1. $s \geq \delta - \overline{p} + 1$.

Clearly,

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |I_i| \geq s(\overline{p} + 2)$$

$$\geq (\delta - \overline{p} + 1)(\overline{p} + 2) = (\delta - \overline{p} - 2)\overline{p} + 2\delta + \overline{p} + 2. \tag{2}$$

If $\overline{p} \geq 2$ then by (2), $c \geq 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1). Let $\overline{p} \leq 1$.

Case 1.1.1. $\overline{p} = 0$.

If $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s) = \emptyset$ then $G\backslash\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s\}$ has at least $s+1$ components, contradicting the fact that $\tau \geq 1$. Otherwise $\Upsilon(I_a, I_b) \neq \emptyset$ for some distinct $a, b \in \{1, ..., s\}$. Let $L \in \Upsilon(I_a, I_b)$. By Lemma 2(a1),

$$|I_a| + |I_b| \geq 2\overline{p} + 2|L| + 4 \geq 6.$$

Recalling also that $s \geq \delta - \overline{p} + 1 = \delta + 1$, we get

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |I_i| \geq |I_a| + |I_b| + 2(s-2) = 2s + 2 \geq 2\delta + 4,$$

contradicting (1).

Case 1.1.2. $\overline{p} = 1$.

By (2), $c \geq 3\delta$. We can suppose that $\delta \leq 3$, since $c \geq 3\delta \geq 2\delta + 4$ when $\delta \geq 4$, contradicting (1). On the other hand, by the hypothesis, $\delta \geq \overline{p} + 2 = 3$, implying that $\delta = 3$. By the hypothesis, $s \geq \delta - \overline{p} + 1 = 3$. Next, we can suppose that $s = 3$, since $c \geq s(\overline{p} + 2) \geq 12 = 2\delta + 6$ when $s \geq 4$, contradicting (1). Further, if $\Upsilon(I_1, I_2, I_3) = \emptyset$ then $G\backslash\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$ has at least four components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Otherwise $\Upsilon(I_a, I_b) \neq \emptyset$ for some distinct $a, b \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, say $a = 1$ and $b = 2$. Let $L \in \Upsilon(I_1, I_2)$. By Lemma 2(a1),

$$|I_1| + |I_2| \geq 2\overline{p} + 2|L| + 4 = 8,$$

which yields $c \geq |I_1| + |I_2| + |I_3| \geq 11 = 2\delta + 5$, contradicting (1).

Case 1.2. $s = \delta - \overline{p}$.

It follows that $x_1x_2 \in E$. Then $x_1x_2\overleftarrow{P}x_1^+$ is another longest path in $G\backslash C$. We can suppose that $N_C(x_1) = N_C(x_1^+)$, since otherwise we can argue as in Case 1. By the same reason,

$$N_C(x_1) = N_C(x_1^+) = N_C(x_1^{+2}) = ... = N_C(x_2).$$

Since C is extreme, we have $|I_i| \geq |\xi_i x_1 \overrightarrow{P} x_2 \xi_{i+1}| = \overline{p} + 2$ $(i = 1, ..., s)$. If $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s) = \emptyset$ then $G\backslash\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s\}$ has at least $s+1$ components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Otherwise $\Upsilon(I_a, I_b) \neq \emptyset$ for some distinct $a, b \in \{1, ..., s\}$. Let $L \in \Upsilon(I_a, I_b)$ with $L = z_1 \overrightarrow{L} z_2$, where $z_1 \in V(I_a^*)$ and $z_2 \in V(I_b^*)$. By Lemma 2(a1), $|I_a| + |I_b| \geq 2\overline{p} + 6$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} c = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |I_i| &\geq |I_a| + |I_b| + (s-2)(\overline{p}+2) \geq s(\overline{p}+2) + 2 \\ &= (\delta - \overline{p})(\overline{p}+2) + 2 = 2\delta + 2 + \overline{p}(\delta - \overline{p} - 2). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Claim 1. $(a1)$ $2\overline{p} + 6 \leq |I_a| + |I_b| \leq 2\overline{p} + 7$ and $|I_i| \leq \overline{p} + 5$ $(i = 1, ..., s)$.

$(a2)$ If $|I_a| + |I_b| = 2\overline{p} + 7$ then $|I_i| = \overline{p} + 2$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{a, b\}$.

$(a3)$ If $|I_a| + |I_b| = 2\overline{p} + 6$ then $|I_f| \leq \overline{p} + 3$ for some $f \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{a, b\}$ and $|I_i| = \overline{p} + 2$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{a, b, f\}$.

($a4$) If $|I_f| = \overline{p}+5$ for some $f \in \{a,b\}$ then $|I_i| = \overline{p}+2$ for each $i \in \{1,...,s\}\backslash\{f\}$.

($a5$) For each distinct $f,g,h \in \{1,...,s\}$, $|I_f|+|I_g|+|I_h| \le 3\overline{p}+9$.

($a6$) $\Upsilon(I_1,...,I_s) \subseteq E$.

Proof. If $|I_f| \ge \overline{p}+6$ for some $f \in \{1,...,s\}$ then

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |I_i| \ge |I_f| + (s-1)(\overline{p}+2) \ge s(\overline{p}+2)+4$$

$$= 2\delta + 4 + \overline{p}(\delta - \overline{p} - 2) \ge 2\delta + 4,$$

contradicting (1). Next, if $|I_a|+|I_b| \ge 2\overline{p}+8$ then

$$c \ge |I_a|+|I_b|+(s-2)(\overline{p}+2) \ge s(\overline{p}+2)+4 \ge 2\delta+4,$$

again contradicting (1). Hence ($a1$) holds. Statements ($a2$)$-$($a4$) can be proved by a similar way. To prove ($a5$), assume the contrary, that is $|I_f|+|I_g|+|I_h| \ge 3\overline{p}+10$ for some distinct $f,g,h \in \{1,...,s\}$. Then

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |I_i| \ge |I_f|+|I_g|+|I_h|+(s-3)(\overline{p}+2)$$

$$\ge 3(\overline{p}+2)+4+(s-3)(\overline{p}+2) = 2\delta+4+\overline{p}(s-2) \ge 2\delta+4,$$

contradicting (1). Statement ($a6$) follows from Lemma 2(a1) and Claim 1(a1). Claim 1 is proved.

Claim 2. $\overline{p}+3 \le d_1 \le \overline{p}+4$ and $\overline{p}+3 \le d_2 \le \overline{p}+4$, where

$$d_1 = |\xi_a \overrightarrow{C} z_1| + |\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} z_2|, \quad d_2 = |z_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{a+1}| + |z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}|.$$

Proof. Put

$$Q = \xi_a x_1 \overrightarrow{P} x_2 \xi_b \overleftarrow{C} z_1 z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_a.$$

Clearly, $|Q| = |C| - d_1 + \overline{p} + 3$. Since C is extreme, we have $|C| \ge |Q|$, implying that $d_1 \ge \overline{p}+3$. By a symmetric argument, $d_2 \ge \overline{p}+3$. By Claim 1(a1), $|I_a|+|I_b| = d_1+d_2 \le 2\overline{p}+7$. If $d_1 \ge \overline{p}+5$ then $2\overline{p}+7 \ge d_1+d_2 \ge \overline{p}+5+d_2$, implying that $d_2 \le \overline{p}+2$, a contradiction. Hence, $d_1 \le \overline{p}+4$. By a symmetric argument, $d_2 \le \overline{p}+4$. Claim 2 is proved.

Claim 3. If $v_1 \in V(\xi_a^+ \overrightarrow{C} z_1^-)$ and $v_2 \in V(z_1^+ \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{a+1}^-)$ then $v_1 v_2 \notin E$.

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is $v_1 v_2 \in E$. Put

$$Q = \xi_a \overrightarrow{C} v_1 v_2 \overleftarrow{C} z_1 z_2 \overleftarrow{C} \xi_{a+1} x_1 \overrightarrow{P} x_2 \xi_{b+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_a,$$

$$|\xi_a \overrightarrow{C} v_1| = d_1, \quad |v_1 \overrightarrow{C} z_1| = d_2, \quad |z_1 \overrightarrow{C} v_2| = d_3,$$

$$|v_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{a+1}| = d_4, \quad |\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = d_5, \quad |z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}| = d_6.$$

Clearly, $|Q| = |C| - d_2 - d_4 - d_6 + \overline{p} + 4$. Since C is extreme, we have $|Q| \le |C|$, implying that $d_2+d_4+d_6 \ge \overline{p}+4$. By a symmetric argument, $d_1+d_3+d_5 \ge \overline{p}+4$. By summing, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{6} d_i = |I_a| + |I_b| \ge 2\overline{p} + 8,$$

contradicting Claim 1(a1). Thus, $v_1v_2 \notin E$. Claim 3 is proved.

Claim 4. Let ξ_f, ξ_g, ξ_h occur on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order for some $f, g, h \in \{1, ..., s\}$ and $w_1w_2 \in E$ for some $w_1 \in V(I_f^*)$ and $w_2 \in V(I_g^*)$. If $N(w_3) \cap \{\xi_{f+1}, \xi_g\} \ne \emptyset$ for some $w_3 \in V(I_h^*)$ then

$$|w_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{f+1}| + |\xi_g\overrightarrow{C}w_2| + |\xi_h\overrightarrow{C}w_3| \ge \overline{p} + 4.$$

Further, if $N(w_4) \cap \{\xi_{f+1}, \xi_g\} \ne \emptyset$ for some $w_4 \in V(I_{h-1}^*)$ then

$$|w_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{f+1}| + |\xi_g\overrightarrow{C}w_2| + |w_4\overrightarrow{C}\xi_h| \ge \overline{p} + 4.$$

Proof. Assume first that $w_3\xi_{f+1} \in E$. Put

$$Q = \xi_f\overrightarrow{C}w_1w_2\overrightarrow{C}\xi_h x_1\overrightarrow{P}x_2\xi_g\overleftarrow{C}\xi_{f+1}w_3\xi_f.$$

Clearly,

$$|Q| = |C| - |w_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{f+1}| - |\xi_g\overrightarrow{C}w_2| - |\xi_h\overrightarrow{C}w_3| + \overline{p} + 4.$$

Since $|Q| \le |C|$, the desired result holds immediately. If $w_4\xi_{f+1} \in E$ then we can use the following cycle

$$Q' = \xi_f\overrightarrow{C}w_1w_2\overrightarrow{C}w_4\xi_{f+1}\overrightarrow{C}\xi_g x_2\overleftarrow{P}x_1\xi_h\overrightarrow{C}\xi_f$$

instead of Q. By a symmetric argument, the desired result holds when either $w_3\xi_g \in E$ or $w_4\xi_g \in E$. Claim 4 is proved.

Claim 5. Every two intermediate independent edges e_1, e_2 in $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ have a crossing with $e_1, e_2 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g, I_h)$ for some distinct $f, g, h \in \{1, ..., s\}$.

Proof. Let $e_1 = w_1w_2$ and $e_2 = w_3w_4$. We distinguish three different cases. First, if $e_1, e_2 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ for some distinct f, g, then by Lemma 2(a3), $|I_f| + |I_g| \ge 2\overline{p} + 8$, contradicting Claim 1(a1). Next, if $e_1 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ and $e_2 \in \Upsilon(I_h, I_r)$ for some distinct f, g, h, r, then by Lemma 2(a1), $|I_f| + |I_g| \ge 2\overline{p} + 6$ and $|I_h| + |I_r| \ge 2\overline{p} + 6$, implying that

$$c \ge |I_f| + |I_g| + |I_h| + |I_r| + (s-4)(\overline{p}+2) = 4\overline{p} + 12 + (s-4)(\overline{p}+2)$$

$$= s(\overline{p}+2) + 4 = 2\delta + 4 + \overline{p}(\delta - \overline{p} - 2) \ge 2\delta + 4,$$

which again contradicts (1). Finally, let $e_1 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ and $e_2 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_h)$ for some distinct f, g, h. Assume w.l.o.g. that ξ_f, ξ_g, ξ_h occur on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order and $w_1, w_3 \in V(I_f^*)$, $w_2 \in V(I_g^*)$, $w_4 \in V(I_h^*)$. We can assume also that

w_3 and w_1 occur on I_f in a consecutive order, since otherwise e_1 and e_2 have a crossing and we are done. Put

$$Q = \xi_f \overrightarrow{C} w_3 w_4 \overleftarrow{C} w_2 w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_g x_2 \overleftarrow{P} x_1 \xi_{h+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f,$$

$$|\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} w_3| = d_1,\ |w_3 \overrightarrow{C} w_1| = d_2,\ |w_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}| = d_3,$$

$$|\xi_g \overrightarrow{C} w_2| = d_4,\ |w_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{g+1}| = d_5,\ |\xi_h \overrightarrow{C} w_4| = d_6,\ |w_4 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{h+1}| = d_7.$$

Clearly, $|Q| = |C| - d_2 - d_4 - d_7 + \overline{p} + 4$. Since C is extreme, we have $|Q| \le |C|$, implying that $d_2+d_4+d_7 \ge \overline{p}+4$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2, $d_3+d_5 \ge \overline{p}+3$ and $d_1 + d_6 \ge \overline{p}+3$. By summing, we get $\sum_{i=1}^{7} d_i = |I_f| + |I_g| + |I_h| \ge 3\overline{p}+10$. Then

$$|C| \ge |I_f| + |I_g| + |I_h| + (s-3)(\overline{p}+2) = s(\overline{p}+2) + 4 \ge 2\delta + 4,$$

contradicting (1). Claim 5 is proved.

Claim 6. If $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$ then $s \le 3$ and either $\xi_a^+ \xi_{b+1}^- \in E$ with $\xi_a = \xi_{b+1}$ or $\xi_{a+1}^- \xi_b^+ \in E$ with $\xi_{a+1} = \xi_b$. If $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$ and $s = 3$ then $|I_1| = |I_2| = |I_3| = \overline{p}+3$.

Proof. Since $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$, either one of the vertices z_1, z_2, say z_1, is a common vertex for all edges in $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ or $z_1z_3, z_2z_3 \in \Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ for some $z_3 \in V(I_f^*)$ and $f \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{a, b\}$.

Case a1. z_1 is a common vertex for all edges in $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$.

If $z_1 \notin \{\xi_a^+, \xi_{a+1}^-\}$ then by Claim 3, $G\backslash\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s, z_1\}$ has at least $s+2$ components, contradicting $\tau \ge 1$. Let $z_1 \in \{\xi_a^+, \xi_{a+1}^-\}$, say $z_1 = \xi_a^+$.

Case a1.1. $z_1\xi_{b+1}^- \notin E$.

It follows that $z_2 \ne \xi_{b+1}^-$. By Claim 2, $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} z_2| \ge \overline{p}+2$.

Case a1.1.1. $z_1\xi_{b+1}^{-2} \notin E$.

It follows that $|I_b| \ge \overline{p}+5$. By Claim 1(a1), $|I_a| = \overline{p}+2$. Moreover, we have $|I_b| = \overline{p}+5$, $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = \overline{p}+2$, $z_2 = \xi_{b+1}^{-3}$ and $N(z_1) \cap V(I_b^*) = \{z_2\}$. By Claim 1(a4), $|I_i| = \overline{p}+2$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{b\}$. Next, by Lemma 2(a1), $\Upsilon(I_a, I_i) = \emptyset$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{a, b\}$. Thus, if $z_1y \in \Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ then $y = z_2$, implying that $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s) = \{z_1z_2\}$. Besides, since $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = \overline{p}+2 \ge 2$, we have $z_2 \notin \{\xi_b^+, \xi_{b+1}^-\}$. Therefore, by Claim 3, $G\backslash\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s, z_2\}$ has at least $s+2$ components, contradicting $\tau \ge 1$.

Case a1.1.2. $z_1\xi_{b+1}^{-2} \in E$.

It follows that $|I_b| \ge \overline{p}+4$. Assume first that $|I_b| = \overline{p}+5$. If $z_1\xi_{b+1}^{-3} \notin E$ then clearly $z_2 = \xi_{b+1}^{-2}$ and we can argue as in Case a1.1.1. Otherwise the following cycle

$$\xi_a x_1 \overrightarrow{P} x_2 \xi_{a+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^{-3} z_1 \xi_{b+1}^{-2} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_a$$

is longer than C, a contradiction.

Now assume that $|I_b| = \overline{p}+4$, that is $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^{-2}| = \overline{p}+2$. If $z_1 y \in E$ for some $y \in V(\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^{-3})$ then by Claim 2, $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} y| \geq \overline{p}+2$, implying that $|I_b| \geq \overline{p}+5$, a contradiction. Hence, if $z_1 y \in \Upsilon(I_a, I_b)$ then clearly $y = \xi_{b+1}^{-2}$. In particular, we have $z_2 = \xi_{b+1}^{-2}$. Further, if $z_1 y \in \Upsilon(I_a, I_f)$ for some $f \in \{1, ..., s\} \backslash \{b\}$, then by Lemma 2(a1), $|I_a| + |I_f| \geq 2\overline{p}+6$, that is $|I_a| + |I_b| + |I_f| \geq 3\overline{p}+10$, contradicting Claim 1(a5). Thus, z_2 is a common vertex for all edges in $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$. By Claim 3, $G \backslash \{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s, z_2\}$ has at least $s+2$ components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$.

Case a1.2. $\xi_a^+ \xi_{b+1}^- \in E$.

By Claim 2, $|\xi_a^+ \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{a+1}| \geq \overline{p}+2$ and $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-| \geq \overline{p}+2$. If $|\xi_a^+ \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{a+1}| \geq \overline{p}+3$ and $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-| \geq \overline{p}+3$ then $|I_a| + |I_b| \geq 2\overline{p}+8$, contradicting Claim 1(a1). Hence, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $|\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-| = \overline{p}+2$, that is $|I_b| = \overline{p}+3$ and $|I_a| \geq \overline{p}+3$. Further, we have $\xi_b^+ \xi_a, \xi_b^+ \xi_{b+1} \notin E$ (by Claim 4) and $\xi_b^+ \xi_a^+ \notin E$ (by Claim 2).

Case a1.2.1. $N(\xi_b^+) \not\subseteq V(C)$.

Let $Q = \xi_b^+ \overrightarrow{Q} v$ be a longest path in G with $V(Q) \cap V(C) = \{\xi_b^+\}$. Since C is extreme, we have $V(Q) \cap V(P) = \emptyset$. Next, since P is a longest path in $G \backslash C$, we have $|Q| \leq \overline{p}+1$. Further, recalling that $\xi_b^+ \xi_a, \xi_b^+ \xi_{b+1}, \xi_b^+ \xi_a^+ \notin E$ (see Case a1.2), we conclude that $v\xi_a, v\xi_{b+1}, v\xi_a^+ \notin E$, as well. If $vy \notin E$ for each $y \in (\xi_b^{+2} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-)$ then clearly

$$N(v) \subseteq (V(Q) \cup \{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s\}) \backslash \{\xi_a, \xi_{b+1} \xi_a^+\},$$

that is $d(v) \leq |Q| + s - 2 \leq \overline{p} + s - 1 = \delta - 1$, a contradiction. Now let $vy \in E$ for some $y \in V(\xi_b^{+2} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-)$. Assume that y is chosen so as to minimize $|\xi_b^+ \overrightarrow{C} y|$. Since C is extreme, we have $|\xi_b^+ \overrightarrow{C} y| \geq |Q| + 1$. Further, since

$$|N(v) \cap V(y \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-)| \geq \delta - (s-2) - |Q|,$$

we have

$$|\xi_b^+ \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-| \geq |Q| + 1 + 2(\delta - s + 1 - |Q|)$$
$$= 2\delta - |Q| - 2s + 3 \geq 2\delta - \overline{p} - 2s + 2 = \overline{p} + 2.$$

But then $|I_b| \geq \overline{p}+4$, a contradiction.

Case a1.2.2. $N(\xi_b^+) \subseteq V(C)$.

Since $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$ and $\xi_b^+ \xi_a^+ \notin E$, we have

$$N(\xi_b^+) \subseteq V(\xi_b^{+2} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}^-) \cup \{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s\} \backslash \{\xi_a, \xi_{b+1}\}.$$

If $\xi_a \neq \xi_{b+1}$ then $d(\xi_b^+) \leq \overline{p} + s - 1 = \delta - 1$, a contradiction. Hence $\xi_a = \xi_{b+1}$.

Case a1.2.2.1. $|I_f| = \overline{p}+2$ for some $f \in \{1, ..., s\} \backslash \{a, b\}$.

If $N(\xi_f^+) \subseteq V(C)$ then as above,

$$d(\xi_f^+) \leq s - 1 + |\xi_f^+ \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}^-| = \overline{p} + s - 1 = \delta - 1,$$

a contradiction. If $N(\xi_f^+) \not\subseteq V(C)$ then we can argue as in Case a1.2.1.

Case a1.2.2.2. $|I_i| \geq \overline{p} + 3$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., s\} \backslash \{a, b\}$.
If $s \geq 4$ then

$$|C| = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |I_i| \geq s(\overline{p} + 3) = (\delta - \overline{p})(\overline{p} + 3)$$

$$= 2\delta + 2\overline{p} + 4 + (\delta - \overline{p} - 4)(\overline{p} + 1) \geq 2\delta + 4,$$

contradicting (1). Hence, $s \leq 3$. Moreover, if $s = 3$ then by Claim 1(a5), $|I_1| = |I_2| = |I_3| = \overline{p} + 3$.

Case a2. $z_1 z_3, z_2 z_3 \in \Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$, where $z_3 \in V(I_f^*)$ and $f \in \{1, ..., s\} \backslash \{a, b\}$.
Assume w.l.o.g. that ξ_a, ξ_b, ξ_f occur on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. Put

$$|\xi_a \overrightarrow{C} z_1| = d_1,\ |z_1 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{a+1}| = d_2,\ |\xi_b \overrightarrow{C} z_2| = d_3,$$

$$|z_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{b+1}| = d_4,\ |\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} z_3| = d_5,\ |z_3 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}| = d_6.$$

By Claim 2,

$$d_1 + d_3 \geq \overline{p} + 3,\ d_1 + d_5 \geq \overline{p} + 3,\ d_2 + d_4 \geq \overline{p} + 3,$$

$$d_2 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 3,\ d_3 + d_5 \geq \overline{p} + 3,\ d_4 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 3.$$

By summing, we get

$$2\sum_{i=1}^{6} d_i = 2(|I_a| + |I_b| + |I_f|) \geq 6(\overline{p} + 3).$$

On the other hand, by Claim 1(a5), $|I_a| + |I_b| + |I_f| \leq 3(\overline{p} + 3)$, implying that $d_1 = d_2 = ... = d_6 = (\overline{p}+3)/2$ and $\overline{p}$ is odd. Hence $d_i \geq 2$ and using Claim 3, we can state that $G \backslash \{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s, z_1, z_2\}$ has at least $s + 3$ components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Claim 6 is proved.

Claim 7. Either $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$ or $\mu(\Upsilon) = 3$.
Proof. The proof is by contradiction. If $\mu(\Upsilon) = 0$ then $G \backslash \{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s\}$ has at least $s + 1$ components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Let $\mu(\Upsilon) \geq 1$.

Case a1. $\mu = 2$.
By Claim 5, $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ consists of two crossing intermediate independent edges $w_1 w_2 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_g)$ and $w_3 w_4 \in \Upsilon(I_f, I_h)$ for some distinct f, g, h. Assume that both ξ_f, ξ_g, ξ_h and w_1, w_3, w_2, w_4 occur on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. Put

$$Q = \xi_f \overrightarrow{C} w_1 w_2 \overrightarrow{C} w_4 w_3 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_g x_2 \overleftarrow{P} x_1 \xi_{h+1} \overrightarrow{C} \xi_f,$$

$$|\xi_f\overrightarrow{C}w_1| = d_1,\ |w_1\overrightarrow{C}w_3| = d_2,\ |w_3\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{f+1}| = d_3,$$
$$|\xi_g\overrightarrow{C}w_2| = d_4,\ |w_2\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{g+1}| = d_5,\ |\xi_h\overrightarrow{C}w_4| = d_6,\ |w_4\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{h+1}| = d_7.$$

Clearly, $|Q| = |C| - d_2 - d_4 - d_7 + \overline{p} + 4$. Since $|Q| \leq |C|$, we have $d_2 + d_4 + d_7 \geq \overline{p} + 4$. If $d_3 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 3$ and $d_1 + d_5 \geq \overline{p} + 3$ then $\sum_{i=1}^{7} d_i = |I_f| + |I_g| + |I_h| \geq 3\overline{p} + 10$, contradicting Claim 1(a5). Otherwise, either $d_3 + d_6 \leq \overline{p} + 2$ or $d_1 + d_5 \leq \overline{p} + 2$, say $d_3 + d_6 \leq \overline{p} + 2$. Further, if either $d_7 = 1$ or $\xi_{h+1}^- w_3 \in E$ then by Claim 2, $d_3 \geq \overline{p} + 2$, that is $d_3 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 3$, a contradiction. Hence, $d_7 \geq 2$ and $\xi_{h+1}^- w_3 \notin E$. By Claim 4, $\xi_{h+1}^- \xi_{f+1}, \xi_{h+1}^- \xi_h \notin E$. If $|I_h| \geq \overline{p} + 4$ then taking account that $|I_f| + |I_g| \geq 2\overline{p} + 6$ (by Claim 1(a1)), we get $|I_f| + |I_g| + |I_h| \geq 3\overline{p} + 10$, contradicting Claim 1(a5). Hence, $|I_h| \leq \overline{p} + 3$. By a symmetric argument, $|I_g| \leq \overline{p} + 3$.

Case a1.1. $N(\xi_{h+1}^-) \subseteq V(C)$.

If $\xi_{h+1}^- w_2 \notin E$ then recalling that $\mu(\Upsilon) = 2$, we get

$$N(\xi_{h+1}^-) \subseteq V(w_4\overrightarrow{C}\xi_{h+1}^{-2}) \cup \{\xi_1, ..., \xi_s\} \backslash \{\xi_{f+1}, \xi_h\},$$

implying that $|N(\xi_{h+1}^-)| \leq \overline{p} + s - 1 = \delta - 1$, a contradiction. Now let $\xi_{h+1}^- w_2 \in E$. By Claim 1(a1 and a5), $|I_f| = |I_g| = |I_h| = \overline{p} + 3$. Moreover, by Claim 2, $d_5 = \overline{p} + 2$ and $d_4 = 1$. Then by, by the same reason, $d_1 = \overline{p} + 2$, implying that $|I_a| \geq \overline{p} + 4$, a contradiction.

Case a1.2. $N(\xi_{h+1}^-) \not\subseteq V(C)$.

We can argue as in the proof of Claim 6 (Case a1.2.1).

Case a2. $\mu(\Upsilon) \geq 4$.

By Claim 5, there are at least four pairwise crossing intermediate independent edges in $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$, which is impossible. Claim 7 is proved.

Claim 8. If $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$ then either $n \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$ with $c \geq 2\delta + 2$ or $n \equiv 1(mod\ 4)$ with $c \geq 2\delta + 3$ or $n \equiv 2(mod\ 3)$ with $c \geq 2\delta + 3$.

Proof. By Claim 6, $s \leq 3$ and either $\xi_a^+ \xi_{b+1}^- \in E$ or $\xi_{a+1}^- \xi_b^+ \in E$, say $\xi_{a+1}^- \xi_b^+ \in E$.

Case a1. $s = 2$.

It follows that $\delta = \overline{p} + s = \overline{p} + 2$. Let $a = 1$ and $b = 2$. By Claim 2, $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^-| \geq \overline{p} + 2$ and $|\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1| \geq \overline{p} + 2$, implying that $|I_i| \geq \overline{p} + 3$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

Case a1.1. $|I_1| = \overline{p} + 4$ and $|I_2| = \overline{p} + 3$.

If $V(G) = V(C \cup P)$ then $n = 3\overline{p} + 8 = 3\delta + 2 \equiv 2(mod\ 3)$ with $c = 2\overline{p} + 7 = 2\delta + 3$, and we are done. Otherwise $N(v_1) \not\subseteq V(C \cup P)$ for some $v_1 \in V(C \cup P)$. Observing that $x_1x_2 \in E$ and recalling that P is a longest path in $V(G \backslash C)$, we conclude that $v_1 \notin V(P)$. Choose a longest path $Q = v_1\overrightarrow{Q}v_2$ with $V(Q) \cap V(C) = \{v_1\}$. Clearly, $1 \leq |Q| \leq \overline{p} + 1 = \delta - 1$ and $N(v_2) \subseteq V(C \cup Q)$.

Case a1.1.1. $v_1 \in V(\xi_2^{+2}\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1^-)$.

By Claim 1(a6), $N(v_2)\cap V(I_1^*)=\emptyset$, that is $N(v_2)\subseteq V(I_1)\cup V(Q)$. Assume that v_1 is chosen so as to minimize $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1|$, implying that $N(v_2)\cap V(v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1^-)=\emptyset$. Clearly, $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1|\leq \overline{p}+1$. Then by Claim 4, $v_1\xi_2\notin E$ and therefore, $v_2\xi_2\notin E$, as well.

Case a1.1.1.1. $v_2\xi_1\in E$.

It follows that $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)\cup V(\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1^-)\cup\{\xi_1\}$. Since C is extreme and $v_2\xi_1\in E$, we have $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1|\geq |Q|+1$. If $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\}$ then clearly $|Q|\geq \delta-1=\overline{p}+1$ and therefore, $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1|\geq\overline{p}+2$. But then $|I_2|\geq\overline{p}+4$, a contradiction. Hence, $N(v_2)\not\subseteq V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\}$, that is $v_2y\in E$ for some $y\in V(\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1^-)$. Assume that y is chosen so as to minimize $|y\overrightarrow{C}v_1|$. Observing that $|y\overrightarrow{C}v_1|\geq |Q|+1$ and $\delta=|\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1|\geq 4$, we get

$$|\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1|\geq 2(|Q|+1)+2(\delta-|Q|-2)=2\delta-2\geq\delta+2=\overline{p}+4,$$

a contradiction.

Case a1.1.1.2. $v_2\xi_1\notin E$.

It follows that $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)\cup V(\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1^-)$. If $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)$ then $|Q|\geq\delta=\overline{p}+2$, a contradiction. Otherwise $v_2y\in E$ for some $y\in V(\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1^-)$. Assume that y is chosen so as to minimize $|y\overrightarrow{C}v_1|$. Since $|y\overrightarrow{C}v_1|\geq|Q|+1$, we have

$$|\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1|\geq|Q|+1+2(\delta-|Q|-1)=2\delta-|Q|-1\geq\delta=\overline{p}+2.$$

But then $|I_b|\geq 4$, a contradiction.

Case a1.1.2. $v_1\in V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-3})$.

By Claim 1(a6), $N(v_2)\cap V(I_2^*)=\emptyset$, that is $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)\cup V(I_1)$. Assume that v_1 is chosen so as to minimize $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}v_1|$, implying that $N(v_2)\cap V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1^-)=\emptyset$. Clearly, $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}v_1|\leq\overline{p}+1$. Then by Claim 4, $v_1\xi_2\notin E$ and therefore, $v_2\xi_2\notin E$.

Case a1.1.2.1. $\xi_2^+\xi_2^{-2}\in E$.

By Claim 3, $v_1\xi_2^-\notin E$, implying that $v_2\xi_2^-\notin E$.

Case a1.1.2.1.1. $v_2\xi_1\in E$.

It follows that $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)\cup V(v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})\cup\{\xi_1\}$. Since C is extreme and $v_2\xi_1\in E$, we have $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}v_1|\geq|Q|+1$. If $N(v_2)\subseteq V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\}$ then $|Q|\geq\delta-1=\overline{p}+1$ and therefore, $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}v_1|\geq\overline{p}+2$. But then $|I_1|\geq\overline{p}+5$, a contradiction. Hence, $N(v_2)\not\subseteq V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\}$, that is $v_2y\in E$ for some $y\in V(v_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$. Assume that y is chosen so as to minimize $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}y|$. Observing that $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}y|\geq|Q|+1$ and $\delta=|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2}|\geq 4$, we get

$$|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2}|\geq 2(|Q|+1)+2(\delta-|Q|-2)=2\delta-2\geq\delta+2=\overline{p}+4,$$

a contradiction.

Case a1.1.2.1.2. $v_2\xi_1 \notin E$.

It follows that $N(v_2) \subseteq V(Q) \cup V(v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$. If $N(v_2) \subseteq V(Q)$ then $|Q| \geq \delta = \overline{p}+2$, a contradiction. Otherwise $v_2y \in E$ for some $y \in V(v_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$. By choosing y so as to minimize $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}y|$, we get

$$|v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2}| \geq |Q|+1+2(\delta-|Q|-1) = 2\delta-|Q|-1 \geq \delta = \overline{p}+2.$$

This yields $|I_a| \geq \overline{p}+5$, a contradiction.

Case a1.1.2.2. $\xi_2^+\xi_2^{-2} \notin E$.

If $v_2\xi_1 \in E$ then as in Case a1.1.2.1.1, $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^-| \geq \overline{p}+4$, contradicting the fact that $|I_1| = \overline{p}+4$. Otherwise, as in Case a1.1.2.1.2, $|v_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^-| \geq \overline{p}+2$. Since $|I_1| = \overline{p}+4$, we have $v_1 = \xi_1^+$, $|Q| = \delta-1 = \overline{p}+1$ and $v_3 = \xi_2^-$. Moreover, we have $N(v_2) = (V(Q) \cup \{\xi_2^-\})\backslash\{v_2\}$. Further, let v be an arbitrary vertex in $V(Q)\backslash\{v_1\}$. Put $Q' = v_1\overrightarrow{Q}v^-v_2\overleftarrow{Q}v$. Since Q' is another longest path with $V(Q')\cap V(C) = \{v_1\}$, we can suppose that $N(v) = (V(Q)\cup\{\xi_2^-\})\backslash\{v\}$ for each $v \in V(Q)\backslash\{v_1\}$. Furthermore, if $\xi_1y \in E$ for some $y \in V(\xi_1^{+2}\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$ then

$$\xi_1x_1\overrightarrow{P}x_2\xi_2\xi_2^+\xi_2^-v_2\overleftarrow{Q}v_1\overrightarrow{C}y\xi_1$$

is longer than C, a contradiction. Hence, $\xi_1y \notin E$ for each $y \in V(\xi_1^{+2}\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$. Analogously, if $y\xi_2 \in E$ for some $y \in V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$ then

$$\xi_1x_1\overrightarrow{P}x_2\xi_2y\overleftarrow{C}\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{Q}v_2\xi_2^-\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1$$

is longer than C, a contradiction. Hence, $y\xi_2 \notin E$ for each $y \in V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$. But then $G\backslash\{\xi_1^+,\xi_2^-\}$ has at least three components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$.

Case a1.1.3. $v_1 = \xi_2^{-2}$.

By Claim 1(a6), $N(v_2) \subseteq V(I_1)$. If $v_2y \in E$ for some $y \in V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}v_1^-)$ then we can argue as in Case a1.1.2. Hence, $N(v_2) \subseteq V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1,\xi_2\}$. If $v_2\xi_2 \in E$ then

$$\xi_1x_1\overrightarrow{P}x_2\xi_2v_2\overleftarrow{Q}v_1\xi_2^-\xi_2^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1$$

is longer than C, a contradiction. Then clearly, $v_2\xi_1 \in E$ and $N(v_2) \subseteq V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\}$. Furthermore, we have $|Q| \geq \delta-1$, implying that $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}v_1| \geq |Q|+1 \geq \delta$. Since $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}v_1| = \delta$, we have $|Q| = \delta-1 = \overline{p}+1$ and $N(v_2) = (V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\})\backslash\{v_2\}$. Moreover, as in Case 1.1.2.2, we have $N(v) = (V(Q)\cup\{\xi_1\})\backslash\{v\}$ for each $v \in V(Q)\backslash\{v_1\}$. Now consider an arbitrary vertex $y \in V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-3})$. Clearly, $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}y| \leq \overline{p}+1$. By Claim 2, $y\xi_2^+ \notin E$. Next, by Claim 4, $y\xi_2 \notin E$. Further, if $y\xi_2^- \in E$ then

$$\xi_1x_1\overrightarrow{P}\xi_2\xi_2\xi_2^+\xi_2^-y\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2}\overrightarrow{Q}v_2\xi_1$$

is longer than C, a contradiction. Finally, since $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$, we have $yv \notin E$ for each $v \in V(\xi_2^{+2}\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1^-)$. But then $G\backslash\{\xi_1,\xi_2^{-2}\}$ has at least three components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$.

Case a1.1.4. $v_1 = \xi_1$.

If $v_2v_3 \in E$ for some $v_3 \in V(\xi_2^{+2}\overrightarrow{C}\xi_1^-) \cup V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-2})$ then we can argue as in Cases a1.1.1-a1.1.3. Otherwise $v_2v_3 \in E$ for some $v_3 \in \{\xi_2^-, \xi_2^+, \xi_2\}$. If $v_3 \in \{\xi_2, \xi_2^+\}$ then we can show, as in Case a1.1.3, that $G\backslash\{\xi_1, v_3\}$ has at least three components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Now let $v_3 = \xi_2^-$. Consider an arbitrary vertex $v \in V(Q)\backslash\{v_1\}$. Since C is extreme, we have $N(v) \cap \{\xi_2, \xi_2^+\} = \emptyset$. Next, if $vy \in E$ for some $y \in V(C)\backslash\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_2^-, \xi_2^+\}$ then we can argue as in Cases a1.1.1-a1.1.3. Thus, we can assume that $N(v) \subseteq V(Q) \cup \{\xi_2^-\}$, implying that $|Q| \geq \delta - 1 = \overline{p} + 1$. Let $w \in V(\xi_1^+\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^{-3})$. Since $|\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}w| \leq \overline{p} + 1$, we have $w\xi_2^+ \notin E$ (by Claim 2) and $w\xi_2 \notin E$ (by Claim 4). Recalling also that $\mu(\Upsilon) = 1$, we conclude that $N(v) \subseteq V(\xi_1\overrightarrow{C}\xi_2^-)$. If $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2, \xi_2^{-2}\xi_2^+ \notin E$ then clearly $G\backslash\{\xi_1, \xi_2^-\}$ has at least three components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Hence, either $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2 \in E$ or $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2^+ \in E$.

Case a1.1.4.1. $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2 \in E$.

If $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2^+ \notin E$ then $G\backslash\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_2^-\}$ has at least four components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Hence, $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2^+ \in E$, that is $\langle \xi_2, \xi_2^-, \xi_2^{-2}, \xi_2^+\rangle$ is a complete graph. If $V(G) = V(C \cup P \cup Q)$ then $n = 4\delta + 1 \equiv 1(mod\ 4)$ with $c = 2\delta + 3$, and we are done. Otherwise, as in previous cases, we can show that $\tau < 1$, a contradiction.

Case a1.1.4.2. $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2^+ \in E$.

If $\xi_2^{-2}\xi_2 \notin E$ then $G\backslash\{\xi_1, \xi_2^-, \xi_2^+\}$ has at least four components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Otherwise $\langle \xi_2, \xi_2^-, \xi_2^{-2}, \xi_2^+\rangle$ is a complete graph and we can argue as in Case a1.1.4.1.

Case a1.1.5. $v_1 \in \{\xi_2, \xi_2^-, \xi_2^+\}$.

Since C is extreme, we have $v_2 \notin \{\xi_2, \xi_2^-, \xi_2^+\}$ and therefore, we can argue as in Cases a1.1.1-1.1.4.

Case a1.2. $|I_1| = |I_2| = \overline{p} + 3$.

We can show that $n = 3\delta + 1 \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$ with $c = 2\delta + 2$, by arguing as in Case a1.1.

Case a2. $s = 3$.

By Claim 6, $|I_1| = |I_2| = |I_3| = \overline{p} + 3 = \delta$ and $\xi_2^-\xi_2^+ \in E$. If $\delta \geq 4$ then $c = 3\delta \geq 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1). Hence $\delta = 3$ and therefore, $\overline{p} = 0$. Put

$$C = \xi_1 w_1 w_2 \xi_2 w_3 w_4 \xi_3 w_5 w_6 \xi_1,$$

where $w_2w_3 \in E$. Using Claims 2-5, we can show that It is not hard to see that

$$N_C(w_1) = \{w_2, \xi_1, \xi_3\},\ N_C(w_6) = \{w_5, \xi_1, \xi_3\}.$$

Analogous relations hold for w_4, w_5. If $V(G\backslash C) = \{x_1\}$ then $n = 10 \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$ with $c = 9 = 2\delta + 3 > 2\delta + 2$, and we are done. Otherwise $N(y) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ for some $y \in V(G\backslash C)\backslash\{x_1\}$ with $N(y) \subseteq V(C)$. Since C is extreme, it is not hard to see that either $N(y) = \{w_2, \xi_1, \xi_3\}$ or $N(y) = \{w_3, \xi_1, \xi_3\}$ or $N(y) = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$.

But then $G\backslash N(y)$ has at least four components, contradicting $\tau \geq 1$. Claim 8 is proved.

Claim 9. If $\mu = 3$ then G is the Petersen graph, that is $n = 10 \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$ with $c \geq 2\delta + 2$.

Proof. By Claim 5, $\Upsilon(I_1, ..., I_s)$ contains three pairwise crossing intermediate independent edges e_1, e_2, e_3. Let $e_1 = w_1w_2$, $e_2 = w_3w_4$ and $e_3 = w_5w_6$. If $w_1, w_3, w_5 \in V(I_f^*)$ for some $f \in \{1, ..., s\}$, then we can argue as in proof of Claim 7. Otherwise we can assume w.l.o.g. that $w_1, w_3 \in V(I_f^*)$, $w_2, w_5 \in V(I_g^*)$ and $w_4, w_6 \in V(I_h^*)$ for some distinct $f, g, h \in \{1, ..., s\}$, where both ξ_f, ξ_g, ξ_h and $w_1, w_3, w_5, w_2, w_4, w_6$ occur on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. By Claim 1(a1 and a5), $|I_f| = |I_g| = |I_h| = \overline{p}+3$ and $|I_i| = \overline{p}+2$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{f, g, h\}$. Put

$$|\xi_f \overrightarrow{C} w_1| = d_1,\ |w_1 \overrightarrow{C} w_3| = d_2,\ |w_3 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{f+1}| = d_3,$$
$$|\xi_g \overrightarrow{C} w_5| = d_4,\ |w_5 \overrightarrow{C} w_2| = d_5,\ |w_2 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{g+1}| = d_6,$$
$$|\xi_h \overrightarrow{C} w_4| = d_7,\ |w_4 \overrightarrow{C} w_6| = d_8,\ |w_6 \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{h+1}| = d_9.$$

If $d_3 + d_7 \geq \overline{p} + 3$, $d_1 + d_6 \geq \overline{p} + 3$ and $d_4 + d_9 \geq \overline{p} + 3$ then clearly $|I_f| + |I_g| + |I_h| \geq 3\overline{p} + 12$, a contradiction. Otherwise we can assume w.l.o.g. that $d_3 + d_7 \leq \overline{p} + 2$. Further, if either $d_1 \geq 2$ or $d_9 \geq 2$ then we can argue as in the proof of Claim 7 (Case a1.1). Hence, we can assume that $d_1 = d_9 = 1$. By Claim 2, $d_4 = d_6 = 1$. By the same reason, using the fact that $d_1 = d_6 = 1$, we get $d_3 = d_7 = 1$.

Case a1. Either $\xi_{h+1} \neq \xi_f$ or $\xi_{f+1} \neq \xi_g$ or $\xi_{g+1} \neq \xi_h$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $\xi_{h+1} \neq \xi_f$, implying that $|I_{f-1}| = \overline{p} + 2$. By Claim 5, $\xi_f^- y \notin E$ for each $y \in V(I_i^*)$ and $i \in \{1, ..., s\}\backslash\{f-1\}$. Moreover, by Claim 4, $\xi_f^- y \notin E$ for each $y \in \{\xi_{f+1}, \xi_h\}$. If $N(\xi_f^-) \subseteq V(C)$ then $d(\xi_f^-) \leq \delta - 1$, a contradiction. Otherwise we can argue as in the proof of Claim 6 (Case a1.2.1).

Case a2. $\xi_{h+1} = \xi_f$, $\xi_{f+1} = \xi_g$, $\xi_{g+1} = \xi_h$.

It follows that $s = 3$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $f = 1$, $g = 2$ and $h = 3$.

Case a2.1. Either $d_2 \geq 2$ or $d_5 \geq 2$ or $d_8 \geq 2$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $d_2 \geq 2$, that is $w_1^+ \neq w_3$. If $\overline{p} = 0$ then $|I_1| = 3$, implying that $d_2 = 1$, a contradiction. Let $\overline{p} \geq 1$. By Claim 4, $w_1^+\xi_2, w_1^+\xi_3 \notin E$. If $N(w_1^+) \subseteq V(C)$ then by Claim 4, $N(w_1^+) \subseteq V(w_1^{+2}\overrightarrow{C}w_3) \cup \{\xi_1\}$. Since $|I_1| = \overline{p} + 3$, we have $|w_1^+ \overrightarrow{C} w_3| \leq \overline{p}$. But then $d(w_1^+) \leq \overline{p} + 1 = \delta - 2$, a contradiction. If $N(w_1^+) \not\subseteq V(C)$ then we can argue as in the proof of Claim 6 (Case a1.2.1).

Case a2.2. $d_2 = d_5 = d_8 = 1$.

It follows that $|I_i| = 3$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, that is $\overline{p} = 0$, $\delta = 3$ and $c = 9$. Clearly $\langle V(C) \cup \{x_1\}\rangle$ is the Petersen graph. If $V(G\backslash C) \neq \{x_1\}$ then it is not hard to see that $c \geq 10$, a contradiction. Otherwise, $n = 10 \equiv 1(mod\ 3)$ with

$c = 9 = 2\delta + 3 > 2\delta + 2$. Claim 9 is proved.

Thus, the result holds from Claims 7,8,9.

Case 2. $\overline{p} = \delta - 1$.
Clearly, $|N_C(x_i)| \geq 1$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

Case 2.1. $x_1y_1, x_2y_2 \in E$ for some distinct $y_1, y_2 \in V(C)$.
We distinguish three main subcases.

Case 2.1.1. There exists a path $Q = z\overrightarrow{Q}y$ with $z \in V(P)$, $y \in V(C)\backslash\{y_1, y_2\}$ and $V(Q) \cap V(C \cup P) = \{z, y\}$.
Assume w.l.o.g. that $y \in V(y_1^+\overrightarrow{C}y_2^-)$. Since C is extreme, we have

$$|y_1\overrightarrow{C}y| \geq |x_1\overrightarrow{P}z| + 2,\ |y\overrightarrow{C}y_2| \geq |z\overrightarrow{P}x_2| + 2,\ |y_2\overrightarrow{C}y_1| \geq \delta + 1.$$

By summing, we get $|C| \geq 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1).

Case 2.1.2. There exists a path $Q = z\overrightarrow{Q}y$ with $z \in V(y_1^+\overrightarrow{C}y_2^-)$, $y \in V(y_2^+\overrightarrow{C}y_1^-)$ and $V(Q) \cap V(C \cup P) = \{z, y\}$.
By Claim 1(a1), $|C| \geq 2\overline{p} + 6 = 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1).

Case 2.1.3. $G\backslash\{y_1, y_2\}$ has at least three components.
It follows that $\tau < 1$, contradicting the hypothesis.

Case 2.2. $N_C(x_1) = N_C(x_2) = \{y\}$ for some $y \in V(C)$.
It follows that

$$N(x_1) = (V(P) \cup \{y\})\backslash\{x_1\},\ N(x_2) = (V(P) \cup \{y\})\backslash\{x_2\}.$$

Moreover, $x_1\overrightarrow{P}v^-x_2\overleftarrow{P}v$ is a longest path in $G\backslash C$ for each $v \in V(x_1^+\overrightarrow{P}x_2)$. Since G is 2-connected, we have $wz \in E$ for some $w \in V(P)$ and $z \in V(C)\backslash\{y\}$. If $w = x_1$ then using the path $zx_1\overrightarrow{P}x_2y$, we can argue as in Case 2.1. Otherwise we can use the path $yx_1\overrightarrow{P}w^-x_2\overleftarrow{P}wz$.

Case 3. $\overline{p} \geq \delta$.
Case 3.1. $x_1y_1, x_2y_2 \in E$ for some distinct $y_1, y_2 \in V(C)$.
Clearly, $|y_1\overrightarrow{C}y_2| \geq \delta + 2$ and $|y_2\overrightarrow{C}y_1| \geq \delta + 2$, which yields $|C| \geq 2\delta + 4$, contradicting (1).

Case 3.2. $N_C(x_1) = N_C(x_2) = \{y\}$ for some $y \in V(C)$.
Let $y_1, y_2, ..., y_t$ be the elements of $N_P^+(x_2)$ occuring on $\overrightarrow{P}$ in a consecutive order. Put $H = \langle V(y_1^-\overrightarrow{P}x_2)\rangle$ and

$$P_i = x_1\overrightarrow{P}y_i^-x_2\overleftarrow{P}y_i\ (i = 1, ..., t).$$

Since P_i is a longest path in $G\backslash C$ for each $i \in \{1, ..., t\}$, we can assume w.l.o.g. that P is chosen so as to maximize $|V(H)|$. If $y_i z \in E$ for some $i \in \{1, ..., t\}$ and $z \in V(C)\backslash\{y\}$, then we can argue as in Case 3.1. Otherwise $N(y_i) \subseteq V(H) \cup \{y\}$ $(i = 1, ..., t)$, that is $|N_H(y_i)| \geq \delta - 1$ $(i = 1, ..., t)$. By Lemma 3, for each distinct $u, v \in V(H)$, there is a path in H of length at least $\delta - 1$, connecting u and v. Since G is 2-connected, H and C are connected by two vertex disjoint paths. This means that there is a path $Q = y_1 \overrightarrow{Q} y_2$ of length at least $\delta + 1$ with $V(Q) \cap V(C) = \{y_1, y_2\}$. Further, we can argue as in Case 2.1.

Case 3.3. Either $N_C(x_1) = \emptyset$ or $N_C(x_2) = \emptyset$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $N_C(x_1) = \emptyset$. By arguing as in Case 3.2, we can find a path $Q = y_1 \overrightarrow{Q} y_2$ of length at least $\delta + 2$ with $V(Q) \cap V(C) = \{y_1, y_2\}$, and the result follows immediately. Theorem 1 is proved. ■

References

[1] D. Bauer and E. Schmeichel, Long cycles in tough graphs, Technical Report 8612, Stevens Institute of Technology, 1986.

[2] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, Graph Theory with Applications. Macmillan, London and Elsevier, New York (1976).

[3] V. Chvátal, Tough graphs and hamiltonian circuits, Discrete Math. 5(1973) 215-228.

[4] G. A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs, Proc. London, Math. Soc., 2 (1952) 69-81.

[5] H.A. Jung, On maximal circuits in finite graphs, Ann. Discrete Math. 3 (1987) 129-144.

[6] H.-J. Voss, Bridges of longest circuits and of longest paths in graphs, Beitrage zur Graphentheorie und deren Anwendungen, Vorgetr. auf dem. int. Kolloq., Oberhof (DDR) (1977) 275-286.

Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems
National Academy of Sciences
P. Sevak 1, Yerevan 0014, Armenia
E-mail: zhora@ipia.sci.am